Date of Hearing: April 22, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION
Blanca Rubio, Chair
AB 1807 (Gabriel) – As Amended March 16, 2026

SUBJECT: Immigration enforcement: use of state-owned property

SUMMARY: This bill would prohibit the use of state-owned property for purposes of immigration enforcement. **Specifically, this bill:**

1) Defines the following for purposes of the bill:

   a) "Immigration enforcement" means any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal civil immigration law, and also includes any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person's presence in, entry or reentry to, or employment in, the United States;

   b) "Staging area" means an area that is used to assemble, mobilize, and deploy vehicles, equipment, or materials, and related personnel, for the purpose of carrying out immigration enforcement operations;

   c) "State-owned property" includes real property, buildings, structures, or grounds owned by the state or a state agency, including, but not limited to, a garage, parking lot, state park, and vacant lot.

2) Prohibits state-owned property from being used for immigration enforcement purposes. Prohibited uses include, but are not limited to, the following:

   a) Staging assembling, mobilizing, parking, or deploying vehicles, equipment, or personnel for immigration enforcement purposes;

   b) Processing, interviewing, temporarily detaining, monitoring and collecting information, or taking custody of individuals for immigration enforcement purposes.

3) Excludes property that is subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party from the bill's provisions.

4) Requires the Department of General Services, in coordination with state agencies, shall identify all state-owned property that has been used, or is likely to be used, for immigration enforcement purposes, including, but not limited to, as a staging area, processing location, or operations base.

5) Requires state agencies to post clear signage stating the following: "This property is owned by the State of California. It may not be used for immigration enforcement purposes," for all properties identified as a state-owned property that has been or is likely to be used for immigration enforcement purposes.

6) Requires state agencies shall ensure that, wherever appropriate, physical barriers, including locked gates, are used to limit access to state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified.

7) Requires state agencies, on or before January 1, 2027, to develop procedures to require a state employee who becomes aware of an attempted or actual use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes to document the incident in writing, include any photographic or video evidence, and immediately report the incident to their supervisor. Requires the supervisor to immediately notify the Attorney General's office or the Attorney General's designee.

8) Requires the Attorney General's office shall design standardized signage for use by an individual seeking to lawfully restrict activities related to immigration enforcement. The Attorney General's office shall make this signage available to download free of charge on its public internet website.

9) Requires state agencies to make available educational materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants, and security staff if federal agents enter state-owned property.

10) Clarifies that the bill does not restrict or interfere with the execution of a lawful judicial warrant.

11) Includes a severability clause.

12) Makes the following findings and declarations on behalf of the Legislature:

    a) During the summer 2025, the federal government engaged in large-scale civil immigration enforcement throughout the state. The use of state property for federal immigration enforcement purposes undermines public trust and confidence in state government;

    b) The unauthorized use of state resources, property, or personnel to facilitate immigration enforcement actions interfered with the state's authority over, and its use of, its own resources, property, and personnel.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Pursuant to the Tenth Amendment, limits the power of Congress to directly compel states to enact and enforce a federal regulatory program. (New York v. United States (1992) 505 U.S. 144, 161.)

2) Establishes the Immigration and Nationality Act which provides guidance and procedures relating to federal immigration law. (8 U.S.C. Section 1101 et. seq.)

3) Prohibits law enforcement agencies from using agency or department moneys or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified, place peace officers under the supervision of federal agencies, use immigration authorities as interpreters for law enforcement matters, transfer an individual to immigration authorities unless authorized by a judicial warrant, and provide office space exclusively dedicated to immigration authorities, and from contracting with the federal

government for the use of law enforcement agency facilities to house individuals as federal detainees for the purposes of civil immigration custody, as specified. (Government Code Section 7284.6.)

4) Prohibits a city, county, city and county, or local law enforcement agency that does not, as of June 15, 2017, to have a contract with the federal government or any federal agency to detain adult noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration enforcement from entering into a new contract with the federal government or any federal agency, to house or detain in a locked detention facility owned and operated by a local entity, noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody. Prohibits a local government or law enforcement agency that, as of June 15, 2017, has an existing contract to detain adult noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody, from renewing or modifying that contract to expand the maximum number of contract beds that may be utilized to house or detain in a locked detention facility noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody. (Government Code Section 7310.)

FISCAL EFFECT: This bill is keyed fiscal by Legislative Counsel.

COMMENTS:

Purpose of the bill. According to the author, "California's state-owned properties are a public trust and must not be used in ways that harm the communities they are meant to serve. AB 1807 is a measured and necessary exercise of state authority, one that protects immigrant communities, pushes back against federal overreach, and defends the constitutional rights of all Californians. We remain committed to ensuring that state resources are used to support our residents, not to advance policies that undermine their safety and well-being."

Background.

Since Donald Trump's 2024 presidential campaign, he has made clear his intent, and that of his administration, to carry out a nationwide mass deportation effort. Since his inauguration in 2025, the administration's immigration enforcement tactics—often described as aggressive and, at times, violent—have drawn widespread attention and criticism both domestically and internationally. Since June 2025, President Trump has ordered California's National Guard into Los Angeles triggering mass protests; engaged in widespread Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raids throughout the state and particularly in Southern California; and carried out or planned targeted enforcement campaigns in cities like Chicago, Minneapolis, and Portland. Throughout California, federal immigration enforcement agents have been using state-owned property to stage and carry out these raids.

In line with California's ongoing efforts to limit resource-sharing with federal immigration enforcement efforts, this bill proposes to prohibit state-owned property from being used for immigration enforcement purposes.

According to one report from National Public Radio, these campaigns have cost cities and localities billions of dollars. The Los Angeles Police Department reportedly spent around $17 million dollars responding to the protests in June 2025. [1]

---

[1] https://www.npr.org/2026/03/24/nx-s1-5739701/ice-surge-trump-finance-cost-cities.)

In response to the administration's targeted immigration enforcement campaigns, a number of these local governments have enacted ordinances restricting the use of local or city government property for purposes of immigration enforcement actions. On October 6, 2025, Chicago enacted its "ICE Free Zone" executive order which banned the use of city property for immigration operations.

Building on the actions of cities and counties that have already adopted similar restrictions, AB 1807 would bar the use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement activities. The bill clarifies that prohibited uses may include, but are not limited to, staging, parking, or deploying vehicles or personnel for immigration enforcement; as well as interviewing, processing, temporarily detaining, monitoring, collecting information about, or taking custody of individuals for immigration enforcement purposes. The measure includes an exception for situations involving a lawful judicial warrant. In essence, the bill would prevent federal agencies from using any state-owned property in ways that facilitate immigration enforcement absent a valid judicial warrant.

The Assembly Committee on Judiciary analysis states, "AB 1807 would exempt any property that is subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party. This exemption, while possibly impacting a significant number of properties, also avoids a potential constitutional Contracts Clause concern where a state-owned property is already being used by the federal government pursuant to a contract executed prior to this bill's enactment date."

<u>The precedent of SB 54 of 2017</u>. For at least the past decade, the California Legislature has taken steps to limit collaboration with immigration enforcement activity, most notably through passage of SB 54 (De Leon), Statutes of 2017. This bill, commonly cited as the California Values Act, limited the use of state and local resources for the purposes of immigration enforcement. Shortly after SB 54 went into effect, the Trump administration challenged the new law.

The administration argued that the statute's prohibition on state and local law enforcement providing a person's release date in response to a request from immigration authorities, providing personal information including an individual's home or work address; and transferring an individual in custody to immigration authorities unless authorized by a judicial warrant or probable cause determination violated the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution. (*United States v. California* (2018) 314 F. Supp. 3d 1077, 1085.) The district court found that SB 54 was not preempted by federal law, and the Administration appealed that ruling. On appeal, the Ninth Circuit ruled against the Administration. The circuit court held that because federal immigration law is silent on the role of state or local governments in immigration enforcement, and SB 54 was focused on *state and local* agencies, the law was not preempted. In particular they stated "SB 54 does not directly conflict with any obligations that the INA or other federal statutes impose on state or local governments, because federal law does not actually mandate any state action[.]" (*United States v. California* (2019) 921 F.3d 865, 887.) The Administration appealed the Ninth Circuit ruling, but the Supreme Court denied the request, leaving the decision untouched and the provisions of SB 54 valid and enforceable law in California.

In addition to limiting the types of information that state and local law enforcement agencies may share with the federal government, the Values Act also prohibits California law enforcement agencies from providing office space to immigration authorities within any city or county law enforcement facility, or from contracting with the federal government to use such facilities for immigration detention. Further, AB 103 (Chapter 17, Statutes of 2017) bars any local

government or local law enforcement agency from entering into contracts with the federal government to provide immigration detention services. The Assembly Committee on Judiciary analysis notes that none of these provisions were directly challenged in *United States v. California,* but present the existing statutory restrictions on collaboration with federal immigration agents and enforcement actions that are most analogous to the current measure.

In February 2026, New Jersey Governor Mikie Sherill signed an executive order similarly prohibiting the use of "nonpublic areas of State property for the purpose of facilitating federal enforcement of civil immigration law," and, absent a valid judicial warrant, prohibiting federal agents and agencies from using New Jersey state property as a "staging area, processing location, or operations base for the purpose of facilitating federal enforcement of civil immigration law."

According to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary analysis, "It is impossible for any committee analysis to predict how the courts may land on a question of constitutionality. How different legal challenges that arise from similar legislation across the country conclude may give us some indication of the fate of this new statute should it become law. The Ninth Circuit's past reasoning on the constitutionality of the Values Act may also provide some indication as to the success of a challenge, particularly insofar as this measure likewise focuses on the actions of the state."

Dual referral. This bill was dual referred to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary, which heard and passed this bill (9-3) on April 7, 2026.

In support. The Western Center on Law and Poverty writes, "California is home to the largest immigrant population in the United States: one in four Californians is an immigrant, and nearly half of all children in the state live in immigrant families. This reality makes trust in government at all levels essential to the safety and well-being of our diverse communities. However, Californians have witnessed a pattern of aggressive, militarized, and at times unlawful federal immigration enforcement actions, including indiscriminate arrests and mass raids conducted without judicial warrants, as well as actions that have been challenged in court. Families in California are in fear of being arrested by ICE or federal agents as they go about their everyday lives at school, work, and in their communities while they access vital public services. ICE and federal agents have relied on using public property, such as parking lots, vacant land, and other spaces, as staging grounds for mass raids and arrests, turning public spaces into sites of fear rather than safety. When the State allows its property to be used in this manner, community trust in public institutions erodes, and families and residents are deterred from accessing the essential services and resources that they need."

The California League of United Latin American Citizens writes, "Since June 2025, federal agents have conducted indiscriminate raids and arrests using unmarked vehicles, masks, and heavy tactical gear throughout California and in some cases on state-owned property. Immigrants and some U.S. citizens were detained in public spaces, at workplaces, and near homes, often in front of family members and neighbors. These reckless federal actions endanger vulnerable immigrant communities as well as U.S. citizens. In preparation for these federal immigration operations, federal agents have been seen staging at various locations throughout California, including, in school parking lots, public parking lots, and college campus parking lots amongst other locations. Staging includes assembling, mobilizing, and deploying vehicles, equipment, materials, and related personnel, for the purposes of carrying out immigration enforcement operations. The use of state-owned property to facilitate federal immigration operations interferes with California's authority over its own resources, property, and personnel. The mass

deportation policies have generated widespread fear not only among undocumented immigrants, but also among U.S. citizens. Beyond the toll this takes on communities, these operations threaten to divert state resources from other public safety priorities – resources that would be better used to protect all California residents."

Related legislation. SB 1171 (Caballero) of 2026. This bill would prohibit the awarding of a grant or loan that uses state funds to a private entity that contracts with United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (Senate Committee on Local Government)

AB 1675 (Lee, 2026) of 2026. This bill would enact the No Tax Breaks for ICE Contractors Act of 2026, which would deny all tax expenditures otherwise available under the Corporation Tax Law to any taxpayer that contracts with United States Department of Homeland Security, as provided. (Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee)

SB 54 (De leon), Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017. Limited the involvement of state and local law enforcement agencies in federal immigration services. Specifically, the bill prohibits law enforcement agencies (including school police and security departments) from using resources to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest people for immigration enforcement purposes.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Alameda County Office of Education
Alianza Sacramento
Alliance for a Better Community
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Asian Prisoner Support Committee
Building Skills Partnership
Business for Good San Diego
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative
California Immigrant Policy Center
California LULAC State Organization
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California School Employees Association
California State Council of Service Employees International Union (SEIU California)
California United for a Responsible Budget (CURB)
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Canal Alliance
CAUSE
Center for Empowering Refugees and Immigrants
Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law
Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
Central American Resource Center of California (CARECEN-LA)
Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy
Change Begins With Me (INDIVISIBLE)

Chinese for Affirmative Action
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
Community Works West
Courage California
Diversity in Health
East Valley Indivisibles
Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities
Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities (EMAC)
End Child Poverty CA
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Glide Foundation
Harbor Institute for Immigrant and Economic Justice
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
Immigrants Rising
Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice
LA Defensa
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children / All of US or None
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE)
Majdal Arab Community Center of San Diego
New Light Wellness
Nextgen California
Oakland Privacy
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
Public Counsel
Rubicon Programs
Sacramento Immigration Coalition
Service Employees International Union, Local 1000
Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network (SIREN)
Siren: Services Immigrant Rights and Education Network
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
South Asian Network
South Bay People Power
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC)
Thai Community Development Center
The Children's Partnership
The San Diego LGBT Community Center
Valor US
Valorus
Viet Voices
Vision Y Compromiso
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.
Women's Economic Ventures
Working Partnerships USA

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Eric Johnson / G.O. / (916) 319-2531